

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

GILBERTO CARRILLO,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DOUGLAS GILLESPIE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:12-cv-02165-JAD-VCF

ORDER

(*Ex Parte* Motion for Additional Copywork #79)

(*Ex Parte* Motion for Legal Supplies Injunction #94)

Before the Court are *pro se* Plaintiff Gilberto Carrillo's *Ex Parte* Motion for Additional Copywork (#79)¹ and *Ex Parte* Motion for Legal Supplies Injunction (#94).

Plaintiff, who is currently in the Nevada Department of Corrections, filed the present *Ex Parte* Motion for Additional Copywork requesting \$45.00 to make sufficient copies of documents for opposing counsel and the Court. (#79). He filed the present *Ex Parte* Motion for Legal Supplies Injunction requesting legal supplies "necessary to accommodate the court and discovery requested by counsels of the defendants." (#94).

Ex parte motions are filed with the Court but not served upon the opposing party. LR7-5(a). Pursuant to Local Rule 7-5(b), "[a]ll *ex parte* motions, applications or requests shall contain a statement showing good cause why the matter was submitted to the Court without notice to all parties." Motions may be submitted *ex parte* "only for compelling reasons." LR 7-5(c). Defendant has not provided the court with a statement in either motion demonstrating "compelling reasons" why the motions were filed

¹ Refers to the Court's docket number.


1 *ex parte*. Absent a LR7-5(b) statement, the Court will not consider these motions on an *ex parte* basis.
2 Thus, the Court denies both motions *without prejudice*.

3 The Court recognizes that Plaintiff is *pro se* and thus should be held to less stringent standards
4 than attorneys, *see Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9 (1980); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21
5 (1972) (*per curiam*), but the Court will not deny opposing counsel the opportunity to respond to a
6 motion when a party does not provide “compelling reasons” for denying that opportunity.

7 Accordingly, and for good cause shown,

8 **IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiff Gilberto Carrillo’s *Ex Parte* Motion for Additional Copywork
9 (#79) and *Ex Parte* Motion for Legal Supplies Injunction (#94) be DENIED *without prejudice*.

10 DATED this 30th day of October, 2013.

11
12 

13 CAM FERENBACH
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25